

4.9 LAND USE and SOCIOECONOMICS

4.9.1 Land Use

Impacts of the Proposed Master Plan

The Proposed Master Plan would result in direct (construction and operation related), and indirect/cumulative land use impacts. Construction impacts relate to impacts to land uses proximate to the site as a result of construction activities occurring on the project site (as well as on streets that serve the project site). Direct impacts also relate to changes or conflicts in the type, character or pattern of land use and the density of development on the site. Indirect/cumulative land use impacts can include peripheral development and/or change in the overall land use character of an area caused by the proposal itself or in combination with other (known) proposed development.

Construction

Construction of the Proposed Master Plan would result in temporary impacts to adjacent lands uses during construction from dust, emissions and noise. There could also be short-term interference with access for adjacent residents or businesses. Construction-related impacts would be temporary in nature and, with proper implementation of proposed measures to minimize the increase in air pollution and noise levels, are not expected to result in significant impacts. (Refer also to the discussion in the *Earth, Air, Noise*, and *Transportation* sections of this Draft EIS for additional details on construction impacts.)

Operation

The Proposed Master Plan would result in the staged demolition of all existing housing units, community service buildings (except for the Wiley Community Center), and storage and maintenance facilities. The site would be redeveloped into a mixed-use, mixed-income urban community with 900 to 1,100 residential units, community uses (e.g., meeting space, recreational uses and various social services) and retail space. As shown in Figure 2.6-1, the most intensive uses would be focused in the center of the project site and separated from adjacent, off-site land uses. Proposed residential structures would be relatively evenly distributed throughout the site.

Table 4.9-1 illustrates the anticipated change in on-site land use associated with the Proposed Master Plan. Overall, the relative mix of land uses would not change significantly. The amount of building area (building footprint) on the site would increase slightly relative to existing conditions (from 19 percent to 20 percent) and the amount of area in lawn/landscape/open space would decrease slightly. Open space would be distributed throughout the site – the largest single open space area would be located in the eastern portion of the site in the approximately 6-acre wooded hillside. With the proposed street vacations and reconfigured street system, the amount of site area dedicated to streets, roads, driveways and parking would also decrease.

Table 4.9-1
COMPARISON OF EXISTING & PROPOSED LAND USES ON-SITE

Land Use	Existing Land Uses		Proposed Land Uses	
	Acreage	Percent of Total	Acreage	Percent of Total
Buildings	17.5	19	18.7	20
Streets/Roads/Driveways/Parking	27.5	29	22.6	24
Lawn/Landscape Area/Natural Vegetation/Critical Area/Parks	46.0	49	44.5	48
Other (Sidewalks, Utilities, etc.)	2.5	3	7.7	8
Total	93.5	100	93.5	100

Note: School district ownership is not included in totals for purpose of identifying changes in land use; the school site is part of the plat, however.

Source: Goldsmith & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Land use conflicts can occur when land uses of significantly different type, scale or intensity are located proximate to one another. These conflicts generally result from externalities such as activity patterns, design, noise, traffic, lighting and odors. The degree of conflict, if any, can also depend on the extent and degree of differences between nearby land uses.

Type of Land Use. The Proposed Master Plan would not result in a significant change to the types of land uses on or off-site. Proposed land uses are generally the same as what currently exists on the site – a mix of residential and community service uses -- with the addition of some neighborhood-scale retail uses (possibly in mixed-use buildings). A significant portion of the site would be devoted to open space, parks and landscaping.

Development of the site would, however, be more intensive, varied and pedestrian-oriented in character compared to existing development. On-site population and employment would increase, as would the overall level of human activity. The quality of urban design would improve significantly, and the character and appearance of the site would be transformed in a positive manner. In general, the Proposed Master Plan is intended to physically integrate the proposed project into the surrounding community and would avoid creating extensive buffers or separations from adjacent uses. Landscaping and setbacks would further this objective.

Surrounding land uses are generally urban residential in character (single family and multi-family), with some retail and service uses; the general area is urban in character. The Proposed Master Plan would be similar to and compatible with these existing land uses. Overall, the Proposed Master Plan would become part of the urban fabric of this portion of unincorporated King County, but with enhanced character, design and function.

The range of non-residential uses proposed on-site would be more varied than what typically occurs in the underlying residential zone and would represent an intensification of such land uses. The Demonstration Ordinance, which the Proposed Master Plan would rely on, permits the range of non-residential uses proposed. Proposed land uses would also be consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan designation for the site (see Appendix E of this Draft EIS) and are compatible with those typically located in urban neighborhoods.

In general, providing a mix of uses within walking distance of residents could promote greater pedestrian activity, reduce dependency on single occupancy vehicles and promote a sense of

community. The proposed mix of uses on and adjacent to the project site would accomplish this by providing some everyday goods and community services in close proximity to residential uses. Similarly, the Proposed Master Plan's pedestrian-oriented design and location proximate to the White Center Activity Center could enhance access to local goods and services.

The Proposed Master Plan also incorporates design features that are intended to maintain land use compatibility with surrounding residential uses. For example, higher density components of the project would generally be located in the center of the site to minimize potential conflicts or contrasts in scale with adjacent off-site land uses. Lower density residential uses would generally be located along the site's perimeters, adjacent to existing off-site single-family neighborhoods, to help create transitions between on-site and off-site uses. In addition, the natural greenbelt along the western edge of the site would be retained to provide a buffer between the proposed redevelopment and residential uses to the west.

Intensity/Density of Development. The Greenbridge site would be more intensively developed than at present – the number of housing units and amount of non-residential space would increase significantly. New buildings would be larger than what currently exist on or adjacent to the site. Such contrasts in building scale are observable in neighborhoods throughout the region and commonly occur in urban neighborhoods as they redevelop over time. To some degree, such contrasts are inherent in urbanization, are not inherently incompatible and are not considered significant land use conflicts in this context. Please refer to the discussion in the *Aesthetics* section of this Draft EIS.

Residential density on-site would increase relative to existing development, currently approximately 6 dwelling units per gross acre. Gross densities would be approximately 10-12 dwelling units per acre. (Please refer to *Appendix E. Relationship to Plans, Policies and Regulations* of this Draft EIS for a comparison of net density as calculated according to King County code and the Demonstration Ordinance.) Similarly, density would be higher than that in adjacent areas, but would not generate significant conflicts. No significant differences in impacts are expected between the lower or maximum number of dwelling units considered.

Indirect and Cumulative Impacts

The potential for indirect land use impacts that could affect neighborhood residents, either adversely or positively, generally depends on the type and intensity of proposed land uses and how they relate to adjacent uses. The overall land use context/pattern can also play a role in determining how susceptible existing land uses are to potential pressure for change. Market and economic conditions can also influence the occurrence of indirect and cumulative impacts.

In general, redevelopment can create pressure for change in adjacent areas. For example, residential uses can generate additional population and increased spending/demand for goods and services (i.e., groceries, restaurants, etc.). These new uses can, in turn, increase pressure for additional change. "Gentrification" – generally defined as redevelopment in deteriorated or aging areas which leads to increased property values, a more affluent population, and displacement of existing/low income residents (Webster's New World College Dictionary, 4th Edition) – is also a possible effect. While such indirect and cumulative impacts are theoretically possible, their occurrence would depend to a great degree on favorable market and economic conditions, local plans and zoning, political support, and other factors.

Relative to existing conditions (and No Action), Greenbridge's larger on-site population and broader mix of income groups could increase local spending for retail goods and services within the White Center Activity Center, located approximately 3-5 blocks west of the project site. Existing King County plans and zoning concentrate most commercial activity in this center, and it provides a wide range of commercial and retail goods and services. Proposed on-site non-residential facilities are limited in type and scale and would meet only a small portion of the demand for goods and services generated by the increased number and composition of residents. The Proposed Master Plan would not significantly compete with most existing uses in White Center, however.

The demand created by the more varied income levels of Greenbridge's larger population could create some pressure for redevelopment or expansion of existing commercial uses within White Center. If it occurred, revitalization of White Center would generally be consistent with King County's objectives for the White Center area. Redevelopment and revitalization within White Center is believed to be possible and a more likely scenario than expansion of the retail area or conversion of residential land uses adjacent to Greenbridge to commercial use. In the near term, uncertain economic conditions could restrain the influence of the population increase and increased spending associated with Greenbridge.

Some pressure for redevelopment could also occur for existing residential uses located adjacent to the Greenbridge site. An increase in income levels and spending, property values and rents, for example, or redevelopment of older or underutilized properties, could indirectly displace some existing residents and lead to "gentrification" (defined above), or some degree of upgrading. It should be recalled that the purposes of the HOPE VI program include upgrading of distressed properties and creation of mixed income communities. Greenbridge itself is not so large as to unilaterally transform the character of the neighborhood. However, it could contribute to such conversion if market and economic conditions over time were favorable, and if substantial public and private investments were to occur. It is generally assumed that any pressure for conversion of land uses would be limited to appropriate locations by King County land use policies and applicable regulations.

Impacts of the Alternatives

Design Alternative Master Plan

In general, land use impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under the Proposed Master Plan. With respect to land uses, it should be noted that the zoning classification for the site (without application of the flexibility permitted by the Demonstration Ordinance) may not permit the full range of non-residential uses assumed for the Design Alternative Master Plan. In regard to density, it is also noted that 900 dwelling units would not be consistent with the zoning code's minimum density requirement for the site (1,127 units); the maximum number of units proposed for development would also be just shy of the requirement.

No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the existing 569 public housing units, community facilities and utilities would remain and on-going maintenance provided to the extent that is economically possible. No demolition of existing structures or redevelopment would occur.

Land use impacts associated with increased residential density and the proposed community and neighborhood retail facilities would not occur. Likewise, however, positive land use aspects of locating community facilities (e.g., library) in close proximity to residential uses would not occur.

Mitigation Measures

No specific mitigation measures are required to address identified land use impacts. The following measures are components of the Proposed Master Plan and address land use issues:

- Location of the majority of the most intensive non-residential development in the interior of the site, where possible.
- Implementation of the proposed open space and landscape features would help offset the proposed intensification of land uses on the site.
- New opportunities for public open space area would be provided by the proposed street vacations.
- Site design would emphasize transitions in density.
- Placement and design of parks and open space would increase views from the site and minimize the “feeling” of higher densities.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Intensification of land uses on-site would occur and density would increase. This change would be consistent with applicable plans, zoning and land use character and is not considered a significant adverse impact.

4.9.2 Socioeconomics

Impacts of the Proposed Master Plan

Socioeconomic impacts include potential changes in area population, employment, demographic/income composition, and economic climate.

Construction

Construction would result in generally positive impacts to employment, wages and income. Project construction would result in the temporary or permanent decrease in employment at KCHA's maintenance facility (see Operation Impacts).

Based on information provided by KCHA, hard construction costs represent approximately \$220.6 million of the total investment of the project based on development of 1,100 housing units and \$181.7 million for construction of 900 units. Labor costs typically comprise roughly one-half of the hard construction costs of a project. The proposed project would, therefore, generate an estimated \$110.3 to \$90.9 million in direct income. Dividing the labor income by the average wage paid to a full-time equivalent (FTE) construction worker in King County

(\$46,607 in the year 2001) yields an estimated 1,950 to 2,367 person/years¹ of construction employment over the estimated 8-year redevelopment of the project (from 2005 to 2012). Direct project construction employment could indirectly increase the number of construction-related jobs in the surrounding area, to the extent that certain types of jobs might be necessary in order to support construction of the project (i.e., materials manufacturing or delivery). **Table 4.9-2** shows the estimated number of direct jobs anticipated for each year of the project for construction (900 and 1,100 housing units).

Table 4.9-2
PROPOSED MASTER PLAN
ANNUAL DIRECT CONSTRUCTION JOBS CREATED
(2005 THROUGH 2012)

900 Dwelling Units					1,100 Dwelling Units			
	Stages				Stages			
Year	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	Total
2005	171	--		171	216		--	216
2006	171	81		252	216	96		312
2007	171	81	128	380	216	96	150	462
2008	171	81	128	380	216	96	150	462
2009	171	81	128	380	216	96	150	462
2010	--		128	128		--	150	150
2011	--		128	128		--	150	150
2012	--		128	128		--	150	150
Total	--	--		1,947		--	--	2,364

Source: KCHA; Huckell/Weinman Associates. 2003.

The remaining half of the hard construction costs for redevelopment would be spent on materials (\$90.0 to \$110.3 million), including lumber, cement, tools, and other products essential to complete construction. It is assumed that the majority of construction materials would be purchased within the Puget Sound region. It is likely that the businesses selling construction materials would benefit through increased revenues; employment could also increase in order to meet the increase in demand for goods.

Relocation of residents during staged construction could result in reduced revenues to area merchants, as well as temporary disruption to the lives of residents. It is possible that all or part of this reduction in local business revenues could be offset by spending from the temporary influx of construction workers. In so far as relocation to temporary housing occurs in a relatively even distribution to the surrounding area, there would be few, if any, adverse impacts to the existing surrounding infrastructure and community. Positive impacts could include an increase in local hiring, expansion of businesses, new business formation, and greater local tax revenues. In addition, KCHA and participating on-site community service agencies have committed to hire residents for construction and community service positions, where appropriate. Training for construction-related skills would be coordinated through KCHA and the construction companies.

¹ A person/year of employment is not equivalent to a job since one person could hold the same job over a number of years. Person/years are converted to jobs by dividing the number of years of anticipated employment, which in this case is the length of each construction phase.

Operation

Population Characteristics

Population on-site would increase from 1,656 residents (in 569 units) to a range of 2,313 to 2,832 residents (in 900 to 1,100 units).² An increase in higher-income households (see the Housing discussion below) and the introduction of market-rate housing for owners would occur. The number of units available on-site to low-income households³ would decrease. Together, these changes would alter the socioeconomic dynamics and demographics of the community and surrounding neighborhood. Middle-income residents attracted to the market-rate for-sale and rental units proposed for the site, would reduce the percentage of low-income residents. The increase in housing types could tend to economically diversify the community over what currently exists. These effects are among the objectives of the HOPE VI program. The extent of change in racial and ethnic diversity within the Proposed Master plan is unknown.

The availability of market-rate rental and for-sale housing could influence the age distribution of residents on-site. Relative to the age distribution and housing types found in the surrounding area and throughout King County, the number of residents aged 17 years and younger (currently 40.3 percent at Park Lake⁴) would likely decrease, while the number of residents aged 18 years and older would increase. In the surrounding area and King County, approximately 25.5 percent and 22.5 percent of the population, respectively, is made up of residents aged 17 years and younger (see Table 3.9-5, Age Profiles in *Section 3.9 Land Use and Socioeconomics* of this Draft EIS). Senior residents (65 and older) currently comprise 6.7 percent of the existing population at Park Lake; the surrounding area and King County have a greater number of seniors, approximately 9.7 percent and 10.5 percent respectively. It is anticipated that, with the shift in housing stock from all public housing to a mix of housing types, the age distribution within Greenbridge would reflect the surrounding area to a greater extent.

Employment and Income

New and expanded community facilities would result in the creation of jobs to support the additional services. It is estimated that employment (FTE) would increase by at least 21.5 jobs (FTE), in addition to existing jobs (see *Section 3.9*, of this Draft EIS for discussion of existing employment).⁵ This number could increase over time, as the community service organizations adjust to changes in demands for service resulting from the increase in residential population and larger physical spaces.

By the beginning of Stage I (2005), KCHA's maintenance facility would lose 11 of its 27 employees. KCHA would transfer a portion of its maintenance responsibility, relative to the proposed decrease in public housing units, to individual homeowners and developers. Homeowners and housing managers would be responsible for maintenance of the for-sale

² The estimated population range was determined by calculating the average number of residents per dwelling unit (2.52 residents per renter-occupied unit; 2.67 residents per owner-occupied unit) in the study area (using Census 2000 data) and multiplying the number of residents per ownership type with the proposed housing types at Greenbridge.

³ Low incomes are classified as: extremely low-income (0 to 30 percent of area median income); very low-income (31 to 50 percent of area median income); and low-income (51 to 80 percent of area median income).

⁴ Park Lake Homes currently contains all rental public housing. The proposed development would include housing types similar to those found in the study area and within other areas of King County.

⁵ Employees would be added to the following new or expanded facilities: King County Branch Library (6-8 employees); High Line Head Start and Child Care (10 employees); White Center Food Bank (0.5 employees); and Neighborhood House (3 employees). These numbers are based on existing estimates only; other on-site facilities, including the commercial uses and other community uses, may also add employees (Tonkin Hoyne Lokan, 2003). These numbers were not available at this time.

housing units and workforce housing units. The existing residents' employment would not be adversely affected by this reduction in jobs, as none of the maintenance facility employees currently reside at the project site.

It is anticipated that the average on-site annual income would increase as a result of the shift from all public housing units to a mix of public housing, market-rate rentals, and for-sale units. Increased income levels and increased spending by Greenbridge residents, could result in a positive impact on area business and local tax revenues.

Indirect Impacts

During periods of high construction activity, area businesses and services could experience indirect impacts to revenues from construction traffic, rerouting of traffic, utilities service disruptions, and limited access. These impacts would be temporary.

Positive indirect impacts, mentioned above, would include improvement to the character of the site (i.e., open space, landscaping, improved building conditions, architectural styling); a more diverse housing stock and economically diverse population; and increased spending for goods and services within the area surrounding the site, as well as within the greater White Center, Burien and West Seattle areas. Residents of the market-rate housing would likely have higher levels of disposable income.

The proposed project could also contribute to economic development within the surrounding area, including building renovation/expansion, new construction, and business start-ups. As a result, residents could enjoy increased employment opportunities.

The proposed project could have a favorable effect on real estate located adjacent and nearby. Residential properties could appear more desirable, resulting in an increase in demand for housing in the study area. Increased demand for housing within the study area, could also result in increases in property values, and rental rates and taxes. This could decrease affordability for some residents, forcing them to relocate.

Relocation of existing residents could result in temporary or permanent stresses to their social activities and/or affiliations. Relocation could, for example, make it more difficult to maintain participation in neighborhood clubs, organizations, and religious institutions. Whether such ties are stressed or ruptured would depend on a variety of factors, including the physical distance involved, mobility options, substitute opportunities in the new location, length of the relocation, and personal choice. Residents temporarily or permanently relocating to more distant neighborhoods could find it less convenient to maintain their current affiliations. Conversely, those temporarily or permanently relocating to nearby neighborhoods could more easily maintain current affiliations. For additional discussion of related issues, please refer to the Housing section, below, and to *Section 4.10, Environmental Justice*.

Cumulative Impacts

A potential increase in business development and in employment provided on-site (through the community facilities) could contribute to a decrease in unemployment in the immediate area (currently 53.1 percent within Census Tract 265). In addition, a number of new residents (already employed) may be drawn to move to Greenbridge because of its affordability, community services, and/or unique design characteristics, but would not add to the demand for

employment among other residents. Subsequently, such residents would have a positive impact on the local unemployment rate.

Significant Impacts of the Alternatives

Design Alternative Master Plan

Redevelopment under the Design Alternative Master Plan would create similar socioeconomic impacts, as described for the Proposed Master Plan.

Hard construction costs are estimated at approximately \$183.6 to \$223.3 million, approximately \$1.9 to \$2.6 million, more than the proposed project. Labor costs would generate an estimated \$91.8 to \$111.6 million in direct income and 1,968 to 2,400 person/years of construction activity (21 to 36 more jobs than the proposed project). **Table 4.9-3** provides an estimate of the construction jobs for each year of project construction. Materials costs would comprise the remaining costs for hard construction, or \$91.8 to \$111.6 million.

Table 4.9-3
DESIGN ALTERNATIVE MASTER PLAN DIRECT
ANNUAL CONSTRUCTION JOBS CREATED (2005 THROUGH 2012)

900 Dwelling Units					1,100 Dwelling Units			
	Stages				Stages			
Year	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	Total
2005	174	--		174	220			216
2006	174	81		255	220	97		312
2007	174	81	129	384	220	97	152	462
2008	174	81	129	384	220	97	152	462
2009	174	81	129	384	220	97	152	462
2010	--		129	129		--	152	150
2011	--		129	129		--	152	150
2012	--		129	129		--	152	150
Total	--	--		1,968		--	--	2,400

Source: KCHA; Huckell/Weinman Associates. 2003.

No Action Alternative

Redevelopment would not occur under the No Action Alternative. No new employment or income would be created. The population on-site would remain unchanged; the existing demographic, income and household characteristics would continue. Low-income households would remain concentrated on the project site without improvements to housing conditions or increased efforts toward assisting residents with job training and other social support.

The HOPE VI funds provided by HUD would not be available for redevelopment of the site. Potential indirect impacts (e.g., increased spending, business revitalization) would not occur. Economic conditions in the immediate area would remain unchanged.

Mitigation Measures

KCHA would alert local businesses and merchants about opportunities to conduct business with the site development contractors (i.e., subcontracting, materials purchasing).

As identified in the master planning process, development of the site would include working with residents to improve earning potential, income levels, family stability, and self-sufficiency through all available programs and support services (i.e., YWCA Career Development Center, Highline Community College, Seattle-King County Private Industry Council, King County Jobs Initiatives, Refugee Federation Service Center).

During construction, KCHA would encourage contractors to hire residents and would coordinate with contractors to ensure the necessary training.

In order to create employment opportunities for new and returning residents, KCHA would encourage new start-up and existing businesses in the surrounding area to hire Greenbridge residents.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to socioeconomic conditions are anticipated.

4.9.3 Housing

Impacts of the Proposed Master Plan

Implementation of the Proposed Master Plan will result in the demolition of all the 569 housing units currently located on the site in order to reconfigure the streets, replace the infrastructure, create new parks and open space, and build new housing, community facilities, and retail space. After redevelopment there would be 900 to 1,100 new residential units, including rental and for-sale housing.

The proposed housing mix and affordability of units to be developed under this alternative is summarized in **Table 4.9-4** below.

Table 4.9-4
HOUSING MIX AFTER REDEVELOPMENT

Housing Type	Number of Units	Affordability
Rental	300	0-80% Median Income*
Rental	200-400	Mixed affordability at 50% to 60% of median income and market-rate rental**
Homeownership	200-400	Mixed affordability for low-income, first-time homebuyers and market rate sales

Source: King County Housing Authority; Huckell/Weinman Associates

*Federal housing policy allows for households with incomes up to 80 percent of the area median income to apply for public housing. However, in practice, the vast majority of public housing applicants have incomes less than 30 percent of the area median income, or between 31 percent and 50 percent of the median. Of the current 3,869 public housing applicants, 89 percent of residents have incomes of less than 30 percent of median and 9 percent have incomes between 31 percent and 50 percent. These 300 units will serve returning residents and households from the KCHA waiting list that have this same income profile.

**KCHA may choose to develop fewer mixed affordability rental housing units in response to availability of financing and market demand. One possible development scenario would result in 200 of these units, 300 units affordable to households with incomes between 0 and 80 percent of the median income, and 400 homeownership units. This potential scenario would not result in any different environmental impacts.

Under the Proposed Master Plan, KCHA would replace all of the 569 existing public housing units with units of comparable affordability. A total of 300 units with rents affordable to households with as little as 0 percent of the median income will be replaced on-site through either the Low Income Public Housing Program or through the use of project-based Vouchers. KCHA will replace 269 units off-site by allocating project-based Vouchers to either existing KCHA-owned, or managed, rental units⁶ or to new units developed by KCHA or another nonprofit, low-income housing development agency.

KCHA was awarded 269 Vouchers by HUD in 2002 for replacement housing as part of the HOPE VI project funding.

Demolition of the existing units and construction of new units are planned in three stages, as illustrated in **Table 4.9-5**.

⁶ KCHA owns a number of projects that were financed with tax-exempt bonds. In bond-financed projects 50 percent of units are rent-controlled and 50 percent have unregulated rents. KCHA will provide replacement housing by allocating project-based vouchers to unregulated units. Or, in order to 1) provide adequately-sized units for large families (requiring 4-bedroom or larger units), 2) increase locational options for extremely low-income households outside of existing low-income neighborhoods, and 3) avoid over-concentrating extremely low-income households in individual housing complexes, KCHA would assign some project-based vouchers to units that are already rent regulated. Those units would, in turn, be replaced by assigning comparably affordable rents to unregulated units.

Table 4.9-5
STAGED DEMOLITION AND DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE

Housing Type	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Total
Demolition	298	37	232	567*
New Units	476-580	100-150	324-370	900-1,100

Source: King County Housing Authority; Huckell/Weinman Associates

*There are a total of 569 housing units at Greenbridge. Two units are located on land provided to the Highline School District for a new elementary school. Demolition of those two will take place as part of the development of the new school, construction of which will begin in 2003.

The housing impacts of this alternative, which are discussed below, include:

- Increased density on the site
- Demolition of the existing units requiring relocation of existing residents
- Deconcentration of low-income housing units and low-income households on the site
- Changes in the housing type and tenure of residents
- A decrease in the number of public housing units on the site and a corresponding increase in the number of units with like affordability in the balance of King County, especially in areas where affordable housing is lacking
- Replacement of 269 public housing units using Section 8 project based vouchers in suburban neighborhoods with strong schools and expanding job markets
- The creation of affordable homeownership opportunities
- An increase in the number of units available for purchase in the study area
- A change in the bedroom mix of units
- Achievement of community revitalization goals
- Increase in handicap accessible, adaptable and visitable units

Increased Density

See the discussion of increased density in the Land Use section and Appendix E.

Demolition and Relocation

Implementation of the Proposed Master Plan will require that all of the existing residential structures be demolished, necessitating relocation of all current residents. Residents will be relocated in three stages. The first stage with approximately 298 households is planned for 2004. The second stage of relocation with approximately 37 households is planned for 2005, and the third stage with approximately 232 households is planned for 2006. Any resident wanting to return to Greenbridge who remains in good standing with KCHA will be offered the opportunity to return.

Because of the federal funding provided by the HOPE VI Program, all residents will need to be offered relocation assistance in compliance with the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and

Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (URA). The URA applies to federally-funded projects that involve the involuntary relocation of people from their homes or businesses.

The HOPE VI program requires KCHA to consider tenants as being permanently displaced by the redevelopment project, thereby entitling them to the benefits available to permanently displaced persons. In addition to these benefits, residents in good standing are given the right to return to the new community. To comply with the URA, KCHA must assist the tenant to move, pay the tenant's cost of moving or provide a cash benefit to offset moving costs. Moving costs include the actual costs associated with moving household goods and personal possessions, as well as the cost of disconnecting and reconnecting utilities and other services. In addition, tenants are entitled to advisory services that include timely notification, assistance finding a comparable unit help completing relocation and housing forms, counseling about social services and amenities in new communities and other assistance needed to minimize the impacts of the move. Any rent differential incurred by the tenant would be paid by KCHA in accordance with the URA.

Deconcentration of Low-income Housing

Reducing the high concentration of assisted housing units and extremely low-income households that comprise public housing communities is an important goal of the HOPE VI Program. In the case of Greenbridge, a mixed income community will result from a reduction in the number of public housing units on the site, as well as the addition of new affordable and market-rate rental and ownership housing units. Implementation of the Proposed Master Plan will result in construction of 300 rental units with like affordability to the 569 public housing units currently on the site. . The balance of 269 public housing units will be replaced by KCHA in off-site locations using project-based Vouchers. KCHA plans to provide replacement housing by assigning the Vouchers to:

- Units in the KCHA-owned, or managed, rental housing stock that have received no capital or operating subsidies and whose rents are unregulated, thereby adding a new unit to the regional affordable housing stock
- Already regulated units in properties that can provide replacement units for large families and/or are in locations that increase dispersal of housing choice for extremely low- and very low-income households and avoid overconcentrating these households in other communities. (In these instances, KCHA will dedicate an unregulated unit to replace the previously regulated unit at a comparable rent.)
- New units that would be developed by KCHA that without the Voucher would not be affordable to public housing applicants
- New units developed by other nonprofit housing development agencies that without the Voucher would not be affordable to public housing applicants⁷

The off-site units will broaden the regional choice of housing location for public housing applicants.

⁷ KCHA could request proposals from developers and award Vouchers directly or could make Vouchers available in conjunction with the King County funding process through which capital funds for assisted housing are awarded.

Changes in Housing Type and Tenure

The 569 existing housing units are in 329 buildings that are a mix of one- and two-unit (primarily) structures. All current residents are renters. Redevelopment of the site through the Proposed Master Plan would result in increases in both the number of structures and units on the site, changes in both unit and structure type, and changes in the tenure of residents.

The number of units on the site would increase from the current 569 units to between 900 and 1,100 units, depending on the final outcome of feasibility analysis and market conditions. This is an overall increase of between 58 percent and 93 percent in the number of housing units. A more diverse mix of structure types would also result, with single-family houses, cottages, townhouses, and apartments replacing the current one- and two-unit structures. The number of rental units on the site would slightly increase (by 31 units) if 900 total units are constructed. The increase would be more significant (131 units) if 1,100 units are built. In addition, the proposed redevelopment would introduce housing for homeowners onto the site. One third of the 900 new units (300 units) would be for sale to first-time and repeat homebuyers. Slightly more than one third (400 units, 36 percent) of the 1,100 units would be for sale.

Changes in Unit Affordability

The 569 public housing units currently on the site are affordable to households with incomes of between 0 percent and 80 percent of the area median income, with the majority (88 percent) of residents having incomes below 30 percent of the area median. With redevelopment of the site under the Proposed Master Plan, the number of units at this affordability level would be reduced from 569 to 300 (269 units of like affordability will be replaced off-site). In addition, between 200 and 400 new mixed affordability rental units would be developed. The exact affordability mix of these new units has not been determined and will be influenced by available financing and market demand. Some portion (likely the majority) will be affordable to households with 50 percent to 60 percent of the area median income and the balance will rent at market rates. Those rental units affordable at between 50 percent and 60 percent of the area median will increase the County's overall stock of affordable rental housing and will be a positive impact of this alternative over and above the one-for-one replacement of the public housing units. The replacement of the 269 housing units off-site will maintain, on a more dispersed basis, the current countywide supply of units affordable to housing tenants earning less than 30 percent of median income.

The development of the 200 to 400 for-sale units would create homeownership opportunities on the site for the first time. Some of the units would be for sale to low-income (income of 80 percent or less of the area median income), first-time homebuyers eligible for downpayment and other types of financial assistance from existing programs. The balance would be sold at market rates. Development of these units would increase ownership opportunities in the study area.

Change in Rental Unit Bedroom Mix

Table 4.9-6 compares the current bedroom-mix for rental units to that of the Proposed Master Plan.

Table 4.9-6
RENTAL UNIT BEDROOM MIX PRE- AND POST-REDEVELOPMENT

Bedrooms	Units in Current Development		Units After Redevelopment	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
1	53	9%	215-274	36.6%-38.4%
2	354	62%	255-309	43.3%-43.5%
3	147	26%	94-109	15.3%-16.1%
4	15	3%	17	2.4%-2.9%
5	0	0%	5	.7%-.9%
Total	569	100%	586-7157	

Source: King County Housing Authority; Huckell/Weinman Associates

Note: In addition to the 600-700 units replaced on-site, 269 units in a mix of bedroom sizes will be replaced off-site. Also, bedroom mix may vary depending on economic conditions and KCHA waiting list.

The comparison of the pre- and post-redevelopment bedroom mix shows that the number and proportion of one-bedroom units would increase significantly, while two-bedroom units and three-bedroom units would be reduced. The number of four-bedroom units would remain relatively the same and five-bedroom units would be included in the housing mix for the first time.

The post-redevelopment bedroom mix is intended to address the needs of a range of household types including single people, couples without children, and large and small families. The mix was determined, in part, by the needs of returning tenants, demand for public housing and unsubsidized market demand. About 38 percent of applicants on the KCHA public housing waiting list need one-bedroom units, 41 percent are waiting for two-bedroom units, and 16 percent need a three-bedroom unit. The increase in four-bedroom and five-bedroom units addresses the demand for units by extremely low-income large families. Market demand is for a mix of one-, two- and three-bedroom units. Because the proposed unit mix is based on current demand, the changes are expected to result in a positive impact on availability of appropriately sized units.

Community Revitalization

The social problems (i.e. crime, low educational attainment, high unemployment) that affect Park Lake Homes, the current public housing community, and the surrounding White Center community, result, in part, from the concentration and isolation of large numbers of low-income households on the site. The creation of a mixed income community through implementation of the Proposed Master Plan is intended to partially alleviate the social issues that have historically affected the community. The emphasis in the new community will be on replacing the demolished public housing units with a variety of affordable units and tenures, all of which encourage public housing residents to remain in the community as their lives stabilize and improve. The affordable and market-rate rental and for-sale units will attract moderate- and

middle-income households to help economically diversify the community. The community will experience some short-term disruption due to resident relocation and construction activity.

The revitalization of Park Lake Homes envisioned by the Proposed Master Plan is consistent with the housing and community development objectives of King County that are expressed in the *Consolidated Plan*. A primary King County housing objective is to:

“Preserve and expand the supply of affordable housing for low- and moderate-income households.”

The discussion of this objective in the *Consolidated Plan* specifically cites the Greenbridge project and summarizes its impact as follows:

“The Park Lake [now Greenbridge] HOPE VI initiative is consistent with and would further several of the Consortium’s [King County Community Development Block Grant and HOME Program Consortium] objectives to address housing needs, including: the promotion of an equitable and rational distribution of affordable housing throughout King County, the promotion of diverse neighborhoods, the revitalization of substandard housing and distressed communities and the promotion of fair housing choice for all residents of the Consortium.”

Another of the County's stated objectives is:

“Improve flood/storm drain systems, water systems, sewer systems, sidewalks, and other public infrastructure in low- and moderate-income and /or blighted neighborhoods including improving access for persons with disabilities by removal of architectural barriers in existing infrastructure.”

The new infrastructure that will be constructed as part of the Proposed Master Plan is consistent with this community development objective.

Cumulative Impacts

Redevelopment of three other public housing communities will have recently been completed, or will be underway, at the same time that redevelopment of Park Lake Homes into the new mixed income community of Greenbridge is occurring. All three are HOPE VI redevelopments of garden communities owned by the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA). They are NewHolly (previously Holly Park), Rainier Vista, and High Point. Distances ranging from about 1.5 miles to about 4 miles separate these communities from each other. In each case, all existing housing units are being demolished. **Tables 4.9-7** and **4.9-8** provide information on the timing of the redevelopment and the numbers of units to be demolished and redeveloped at each site.

Table 4.9-7
REDEVELOPMENT SCHEDULES

Community	Demolition Begins	Construction Complete
NewHolly	1996	2004
Rainier Vista	2002	2008
High Point	2003	2009
Greenbridge	2005	2012

Source: King County Housing Authority; Seattle Housing Authority

Table 4.9-8
HOUSING UNITS BEFORE AND AFTER REDEVELOPMENT

Community	Units Before Redevelopment	Units After Redevelopment
NewHolly	871	1,390
Rainier Vista	481	1,010
High Point	716	1,600
Greenbridge	569	900-1,100

Source: King County Housing Authority; Seattle Housing Authority

The following discussion assesses the potential for cumulative impacts from the roughly simultaneous redevelopment of these four public housing communities on housing relocation options for current residents and on the supply of housing for extremely low- and very low-income households in King County.

Adequacy of Housing Relocation Options

In the case of each project, all existing public housing units will be demolished, requiring either temporary or permanent relocation of residents. Both housing authorities have, or will, offer a package of relocation benefits that is consistent with the requirements of the URA. SHA tenants will have the choice of relocating temporarily to on-site units that will not be removed until later stages of demolition. Both housing authorities offer residents vacant units in other housing authority-owned projects. Tenants may also elect to take a tenant-based Voucher and move temporarily or permanently from any one of the communities. A potential cumulative impact would result if the increased number of families with Vouchers seeking housing in the King County market could not be accommodated by the existing housing supply.⁸

⁸ Not all landlords will accept Vouchers and not all units are in the physical condition or rent for levels acceptable under the Voucher program.

This potential impact would be mitigated by a number of factors including:

- The staging of relocation of residents and of construction. All of the projects will be implemented in stages—two stages at Rainier Vista and High Point, and three stages at Greenbridge and NewHolly. Because the projects are occurring over a number of years, and not all residents of any one project are relocating at the same time (i.e., relocation at NewHolly is complete and Rainier Vista and High Point are each 55 percent complete), the increased number of Voucher-holders looking for housing is unlikely to overwhelm the market.
- The ease of use of Vouchers in King County. KCHA maintains information on the utilization rate of Vouchers. In the last six months, the time between the issuance of a Voucher to a family and the family finding and renting a unit has decreased from 46 to 38 days, and over the last three years, KCHA has consistently maintained a Voucher lease-up rate of 96 percent.
- The current rental housing market. The current rental market in King County has suffered with the severity of the local economic downturn. According to Mike Scott, publisher of the semi-annual *Apartment Vacancy Report* for the Puget Sound region, vacancy rates are the highest they have been for 20 years. The County is experiencing a “renter’s market” and current conditions are expected to continue into 2005. These conditions are easing any difficulty renters might have in finding affordable, appropriately located units.

Potential Loss of Public Housing

Both the Seattle and King County housing authorities have committed to the one-for-one replacement, at like affordability, of all housing units demolished in the course of redevelopment of the four communities. In the case of all four projects, units affordable to public housing residents will be replaced through a combination of on- and off-site development. **Table 4.9-9** illustrates the number and location (on-site or off-site) of public housing replacement units.

Table 4.9-9
REPLACEMENT HOUSING PLANS

Community	Public Housing Units	Units Replaced On-Site	Units Replaced Off-Site
NewHolly	871	530	341
Rainier Vista	481	410	71
High Point	716	466	250
Greenbridge	569	300	269

Source: King County Housing Authority; Seattle Housing Authority

Because all existing public housing units will be replaced with rent-comparable units, *there will be no net loss of units*. In addition, because the units will no longer be as concentrated in the

four developments, households qualifying for public housing will have expanded choices of affordable housing locations.

To date, some replacement housing for each of SHA's projects has been developed. For NewHolly, 542 (62 percent) of the 871 public housing units have been replaced, including both on-site and off-site units. Rainer Vista and High Point are both in the very early stages of redevelopment. For Rainier Vista 20 units have been replaced and for High Point the current total of replacement units is 51. In both of the latter cases, units have been replaced off-site.⁹

It should also be noted, 254 households living at NewHolly at the time the redevelopment was initiated expressed a desire to return to a unit on the site post redevelopment. To date 227 (89 percent) of those households have returned and are living in a new unit. The SHA website¹⁰ that provides information on the relocation outcomes at NewHolly notes:

"By April 2002 the relocation process for all of the 832 original Holly Park households was completed. Even though the third stage of the redevelopment is still in process, the needs of all original households have now been met.

Eighty-nine percent of those whose first choice was to return to NewHolly were able to do so (227 out of 254 households). In many cases, it was these residents who helped to retain the cultural assets of the original, diverse, neighborhood and welcomed new residents as they arrived.

In general, the population of low-income neighborhoods such as Holly Park tends to be very dynamic. Without the redevelopment process, only about 50 percent of the residents in Holly Park in 1996 would most likely be there five years later. By 2002 we would expect that only 300 or so of the original 1996 residents would still be living there."

Based on experience at NewHolly, and based on commitments made for replacement housing for Rainier Vista, High Point and proposed for Park Lake Homes, there is no cumulative negative impact on the County's public housing stock.

Construction

The impacts of the Proposed Master Plan on residents remaining on the site during construction have been addressed in other sections of the EIS dealing with noise, air quality, and traffic. The major impact on residents would be the need to relocate during the construction. Relocation requirements and assistance are discussed in Mitigation Measures.

Impacts of the Alternatives

Design Alternative Master Plan

The housing impacts of the Design Alternative Master Plan would be the same as those of the Proposed Master Plan.

⁹ All replacement units have been created either with public housing subsidies or project-based Vouchers and are affordable to households with less than 30 percent of the area median income.

¹⁰ <http://www.sea-pha.org/development/newholly/relocation.html>

No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, redevelopment of the site would not occur and only limited repair of the existing housing units would be done, subject to KCHA's ability to identify funding. The housing impacts of this alternative would be:

- Continued deterioration of the housing units due to their age, construction quality, and the limited availability of funding for repair and rehabilitation
- Loss of the \$35 million of HOPE VI funding
- Loss of the opportunity to achieve revitalization of a distressed community, to expand the housing options (both quality and location of housing) for low-income households, and to increase homeownership opportunities in the area

Condition of the Housing

The residential buildings at Park Lake Homes have exceeded their useful life. The community was constructed in the early 1940's as "temporary" housing for WWII defense workers. The original quality of construction was poor because, as temporary housing, the units were never intended to be in service for over 60 years. The current condition of the housing units is such that HUD recognizes Park Lake Homes as a "severely distressed" public housing community, one of the conditions precedent to the award of HOPE VI funding. Park Lake Homes housing units are in need of the following major structural and mechanical repairs.

- Roof replacement
- Foundation replacement
- Replacement of electrical, plumbing, and heating systems
- Addition of insulation to both the units and the major systems
- Abatement of lead-paint and asbestos
- New floors
- New windows
- Improved ventilation to retard the growth of mold
- Correction of site drainage problems

Redevelopment is meant to address other substandard physical conditions, including:

- lack of handicap person visitability, adaptability and accessibility;
- lack of storage;
- lack of second bathrooms;
- absence of sidewalks;
- lack of organized park and play space;
- lack of good connections to surrounding community; and
- lack of adequate space in family units.

Rehabilitation of Existing Housing and the Loss of HOPE VI Funding

Under the *No Action* alternative, KCHA would continue to try and maintain the units and incrementally make limited improvements based on funding availability. The only designated source of public housing rehabilitation funds available to KCHA is HUD's Capital Grant Program (CGP). Through the CGP, housing authorities are granted funds for repair of public housing based on a formula allocation. KCHA's annual allocation is approximately \$6.7 million. This is

the only funding provided by HUD to assist KCHA will be the repair of all of its 3,384 public housing units. KCHA's application for HOPE VI funding notes that, "Using a combination of in-house inspection staff and outside consultants, KCHA has conducted a comprehensive needs assessment of its aging public housing inventory and identified over \$50 million in critical needs, *exclusive* of Park Lake Homes."

Prior to making the HOPE VI application, KCHA engaged three experts to determine strategies for preserving the project. Each expert reached the conclusion that preservation of the property was no longer viable because: (1) buildings and systems have reached the end of their life cycle; (2) air quality and hazardous materials pose health risks for residents; (3) the cost of rehabilitation is almost as much as reconstruction; (4) small units are not adequate for families; and (5) there is no room to widen hallways and bathrooms to improve handicap accessibility.

Without renovation, units may have to be closed and/or demolished as they age and their condition deteriorates further. This would result in the permanent loss of the housing units and the displacement of residents.

The HOPE VI funding was to accomplish the following outcomes.

- Redevelopment of the site into a mixed income community
- A reduction in the concentration of extremely low- and very low-income households living on the site
- Development of market-rate housing
- Provision of homeownership opportunities
- Reintegrate Park Lake Homes into the existing neighborhood
- Create new facilities for community services
- Leverage substantial new resources into the community
- Work with suburban cities on one-for-one replacement of 269 public housing units off-site in strong job and school markets

Redevelopment must proceed in a way that achieves these outcomes or the HOPE VI funding commitment will be rescinded and the 569 Vouchers recaptured.

Community Revitalization

The No Action Alternative would not achieve community revitalization goals. It would leave in place the concentration of extremely low-income households and the attendant social problems of the community. It would preclude the opportunity to develop new, affordable homeownership options for the White Center area and to achieve a mixed-income community that could reduce the social and economic isolation of current residents.

Mitigation Measures

Redevelopment under either the Proposed Master Plan or the Design Alternative Master Plan would require mitigating the impacts of housing demolition and construction activity on the existing residents. In addition, the redevelopment contemplated by both of these alternatives would result in an on-site reduction of 269 housing units with rents comparable to those of the current public housing units. KCHA proposes to mitigate these impacts by providing relocation assistance to residents and through the one-for-one replacement of housing units affordable to public housing applicants. Planned mitigation measures are discussed below.

Tenant Relocation Assistance

Implementation of the Proposed Master Plan would require the demolition of all 569 existing housing units and necessitate the relocation of all residents. The HOPE VI Program requires that all residents receive relocation benefits as prescribed by the URA. KCHA, with the extensive involvement of residents, has developed the *HOPE VI Relocation Plan Guide* (January 25, 2003) describing relocation benefits and choices. All residents would be relocated off-site during the redevelopment. However, any resident wanting to return to Greenbridge who remains in good standing with KCHA would be offered the opportunity to return to a new unit in the redeveloped community. A November 2002 survey of residents indicated that 71 percent (365 households) hope to return to the redeveloped community.

A nine-person team, CCS Manager, Community Service Coordinator, four Relocation Specialists, Housing Logistics Specialist, and Department Assistant would assist tenants with all aspects of any required relocation. Tenants will have the following relocation options from which to choose.

- Move permanently from Park Lake Homes. Residents who do not want to return to the redeveloped community can elect to receive a tenant-based Voucher (KCHA will receive 300 Vouchers that will be available to assist relocating residents) or relocate to another KCHA owned public housing development. In the resident preference survey conducted in 2002, 114 households indicated that they would prefer to either take a Voucher and live elsewhere (104) or relocate permanently to another KCHA-owned development (10 households).
- Move during redevelopment of the site and return to a unit in the revitalized community. All residents would have the option to return to Greenbridge after redevelopment of the site so long as they remain in good standing with KCHA.¹¹ Residents who plan to return to the new community of Greenbridge may be relocated to another public housing community in the County or to any other KCHA-owned property, subject to unit availability. Forty-three (43) percent of residents responding to the relocation preference survey indicated a preference for relocating to another public housing community. Residents who plan to return may also be issued a Voucher if they choose, or if another KCHA unit is not available. In any case, the cost of a relocation unit would not exceed what the resident has been paying for their Greenbridge unit.
- Buy a home. Based on their income, some residents may take this opportunity to explore purchasing a home. KCHA is developing a comprehensive homeownership program to provide education and counseling for interested residents and referrals to downpayment assistance and first-time homebuyer loan programs.

Residents would be given a full year in which to make relocation choices and move. Written relocation materials have been translated into Vietnamese, Khmer, Somali, Russian, and Arabic. All residents would be counseled on their relocation options in their own language. In addition, KCHA relocation staff would provide the following assistance.

¹¹ KCHA will provide written guidance on how to remain in good standing (i.e. comply with lease requirements in a relocation unit) and updates on project status so relocated residents can prepare to return.

- Conduct outreach and disseminate relocation materials
- Link residents with service providers in areas to which they relocate in order to ensure continuity of services
- Identify available housing options and assist with the search for comparable housing units
- Provide transportation and accompany residents to visit potential units
- Assist residents with applications for relocation benefits and/or rental applications
- Coordinate with moving companies
- Assist with the transfer of utility accounts

The KCHA HOPE VI relocation team would assist residents with their moves, reimburse the resident for the cost of the move, and/or provide a fixed moving expense and dislocation allowance. Moving assistance applies to the cost of the resident's move from Park Lake Homes. Residents can request help with packing and unpacking, and KCHA will pay the cost of utility disconnections and reconnections, as well as storage of personal property, if necessary. The proposed moving assistance would meet the cost allowance and payment requirements of the URA.

KCHA has provided for extensive involvement of residents in relocation planning and has instituted a number of ways to disseminate information about the timing of and resident choices related to relocation, including:

- three community-wide relocation planning meetings to inform the community about relocation and solicit feedback on an effective approach;
- two relocation subcommittee meetings of the HOPE VI Resident Advisory Group to discuss relocation barriers, housing preferences, and relocation services;
- relocation training for the Community Task Force;
- a telephone hotline to provide information on meetings and allow for resident feedback (anonymous, if desired);
- a website that includes regular updates on the progress of the project and answers to frequently asked questions;
- a relocation video available in English, Khmer, Vietnamese and Somali;
- planned articles in the community newspaper (*The Voice*) to share information on relocation benefits, options, Section 8 rules, and development progress; and
- regular relocation orientation meetings that explain relocation benefits and housing options (these meetings are interpreted into the seven primary languages spoken in Park Lake Homes).

Many of the measures described above, particularly those related to communication with residents, go well beyond the specific requirements of the URA.

Overall, the proposed program mitigates the financial and physical impacts of relocation on the tenants.

Replacement Housing

The HOPE VI program does not require the one-for-one replacement of demolished public housing units as a condition of funding. However, the *Park Lake Homes HOPE VI 2001 Revitalization Application* states:

“KCHA is also strongly committed to the concept of one-for-one replacement of demolished public housing units. To that end, the Authority will use a combination of hard units and Section 8 vouchers for permanent and temporary relocation of the families at Park Lake Homes [now Greenbridge] and will ultimately replace all public housing with ‘hard’ project-based subsidies.”

In addition, the *Consolidated Plan* states the County’s support for the project and willingness to collaborate in the planning process for the HOPE VI funding provided that:

“KCHA will provide replacement housing for the public housing units that are redeveloped on a one-to-one basis, through replacement public housing and/or project-based vouchers. . .”

Under both the Proposed Master Plan and the Design Alternative Master Plan, KCHA plans to replace three hundred (300) units on-site and the remaining 269 would be replaced off-site. Off-site replacement units would be created through the allocation of project-based Vouchers to one of the following.

- KCHA-owned, or managed, rental units that are not currently rent regulated
- KCHA-owned, or managed, rent-regulated units that provide the best opportunities for adequately-sized replacement units and that increase the dispersal of extremely low- and very low-income households outside of existing low-income neighborhoods (In these instances, KCHA will dedicate unregulated units to replace the previously regulated units at comparable rent levels.)
- New housing units developed by KCHA
- New housing developed by other nonprofit housing development agencies

Determining if this approach would mitigate the loss of public housing units on the site requires some additional information on public housing operations. Public housing units do not have a rent, per se. Residents of public housing pay 30 percent of their income for rent and utilities. The vast majority of public housing residents have incomes of less than 30 percent of the area median income, with the balance typically making between 31 percent and 50 percent of the area median. Therefore, the amount paid by the tenants for rent does not pay for the costs of operating the housing (i.e. owner-paid utilities, maintenance, and management). Costs not covered by the tenant rent payments are covered through operating subsidies provided by HUD to KCHA. Because of the operating subsidies, all public housing units are affordable to households making as little as 0 percent of the median income who can pay nothing in rent.

KCHA’s policies mirror the federal income eligibility requirements for public housing which are that households with incomes between 0 percent and 80 percent of the area median income are eligible to apply for public housing and that 40 percent of newly admitted families in any fiscal year have incomes below 30 percent of the area median. In addition, preferences are established for households that have 1) been involuntarily displaced from their housing unit, 2) are living in substandard housing, or 3) are paying more than 50 percent of their income for rent and utilities.

While the policy allows for households with incomes up to 80 percent of the area median income to apply for public housing, in practice, 89 percent of applicants and 85 percent of residents have incomes less than 30 percent of the area median and 9 percent of applicants

and 12 percent of residents have incomes between 31 percent and 50 percent of the median income. This is due to implementation of the preferences, the length of the waiting list¹² and duration of the waiting period, and because households with incomes at the upper end of the eligible income range (60 percent to 80 percent of the area median income) can generally afford market-rate units.

Therefore, even though replacement housing units, like all KCHA public housing units, are designated as affordable to households with up to 80 percent of the area median income, they will receive HUD operating subsidies (either through direct Annual Contributions Contracts [ACC] between KCHA and HUD or through a project-based Voucher) so that they will be affordable to households with as little as 0 percent of the median income. For purposes of the EIS, any unit developed either on- or off-site that would be affordable to these extremely low-income households, regardless of the type of rent subsidy, would be considered a replacement unit for those demolished at Park Lake Homes.

The use of project-based Vouchers results in the replacement of units affordable to extremely low- and very low-income households who make up the bulk of public housing residents. The permanent allocation of project-based Vouchers in this way would mitigate the impact resulting from the demolition of the 269 public housing units that will not be redeveloped in Greenbridge. Under both development alternatives, the potential adverse impact of the demolition of public housing units would be mitigated, while at the same time, the overconcentration of extremely low- and very low-income housing in the area would be lessened and neighborhood choices for low-income households would increase.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

All impacts of the Proposed Master Plan and the Design Alternative Master Plan would be either neutral or positive, or would be mitigated by the planned relocation assistance to be provided to current residents or the planned one-for-one replacement of current public housing units with units of like affordability.

The No Action Alternative would produce several significant unavoidable adverse impacts. It would result in the loss of the HOPE VI funding, and would deter revitalization of the community. In addition, rehabilitation would neither address the long-term structural needs of the units and the failing infrastructure, nor the social and economic isolation of current residents.

¹² The Section 8 waiting list of 5,756 households is currently closed. There are also 3,869 households on the public housing waiting list, which remains open, except at Park Lake Site 1, where it is closed.